

REMARKS

Claims 1-134 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 119, 125 and 131 are independent claims. Claims 1-26, 30, 34, 38, 42, 46, 50-67, 73-91, 95, 97-100 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 - Willis

Claims 1-13, 20-25 and 56-134 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,145,581 ("Willis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Applicants respectfully submit that Willis fails to teach each of the elements in any of amended claims 1, 95 and 97-101 as is required to support a rejection under §102. Willis discloses a method whereby global count values are stored as first and second reference data for first and second time intervals and where the first and second reference data are compared while generating a modulated signal (*Willis*: col. 3, ln. 25-55). However, Willis further discloses that the first reference data corresponds to the previous drive signal i.e., the drive signal input at the first time in Claim 1, and the second reference data corresponds to the current drive signal i.e., the drive signal input at the second time in Claim 1 (*Willis*: col. 5, ln. 51-62). Thus, if anything, Willis teaches comparing data corresponding to a signal input at a second time with data corresponding to a signal input at a first time as opposed to "comparing data corresponding to the drive signal input at the first time and data input at a time **previous to the first time**" (emphasis added) as is required by claim 1.

Further, Willis discloses a pulse width modulated (PWM) signal generated with a single transition separating a first pulse from a second pulse (col. 3, lines 64-66). Willis also discloses that either an "ON" logic state is maintained or a single transition may be caused from the "ON" logic state to the "OFF" logic state in the output PWM signal (col. 7, lines 31-34). However, Willis neither discloses nor suggests "**changing a voltage level** of a drive signal input at a second time, subsequent to the first time, based upon the stored data so as to **accelerate** a tone transition from the first time to the second time"(emphasis added) as is required by claim 1.

Accordingly, at least for the reasons stated above, Willis fails to teach each of the elements in amended claim 1 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Additionally, independent claims 1, 95 and 97-101 contain limitations similar to those in claim 1. Accordingly, at least in view of their similarity to claim 1, Willis fails to teach each of the elements in any of claims 95 and 97-101 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Furthermore, claims 2-13, 20-25 and 56-94 depend from claim 1 and claim 96 depends from claim 95. Accordingly, at least in view of their dependency from claims 1 and 95, Willis fails to teach each of the elements in any of claims 2-13, 20-25, 56-94 and 96 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Willis fails to teach each of the elements in any of claims 119, 125 and 131. Claims 119, 125 and 131 claim *selecting between* a determined drive signal and a variation of a determined drive signal based upon at least a previous corresponding drive signal and the current drive signal. Willis teaches a method whereby a signal is either updated or not updated (*Willis*: FIGS 3, 4a and 4b). Willis does not teach selecting from between signals. Thus, Willis does not teach selecting between “the determined display drive signal and a variation of the determined display drive signal” as is required by claim 119, 125 and 131. Accordingly, Willis fails to teach each of the limitations in any of claims 119, 125 and 131 as is required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Additionally, claims 120-124 depend from claim 119; claims 126-130 depend from claim 125; and claims 132-134 depend from claim 131. Accordingly, at least in view of their dependency from claims 119, 125 and 131, Willis fails to teach each of the limitations in any of claims 120-124, 126-130 and 132-134 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1-13, 20-25 and 56-134 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/JHA:mat